

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, 15 and 16 are all the claims pending in the application.

### **I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

A. Claims 1-5, 9, 12, 15 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwoh et al. (US 6,115,057) in view of Corvin (US 2001/0054181).

Claim 1, as amended, recites that the broadcast wave includes a limit flag which limits judgment of said judging unit and a release flag which releases the limitation on the judgment, wherein said judging unit is operable to judge, when said receiving unit receives the limit flag while said display unit displays the broadcast contents, that the broadcast contents indicated by the stream information should be continuously displayed after the reception of the limit flag until the release flag is received by said receiving unit, regardless of a user's operation.

Applicants respectfully submit that Kwoh and Corvin do not teach or suggest at least the above-noted features recited in amended claim 1.

With respect to Kwoh, Applicants note that this reference discloses a display device having parental control features, in which it is possible to block a video display, and replace the video display with textual data (see Abstract and col. 16, lines 15-19). For example, as explained in Kwoh, during the time that PG-13 rated video data is being blocked, textual data is displayed on the screen which describes what is happening in the video program (see col. 16, lines 22-28).

Based on the foregoing description, Applicants note that while Kwoh discloses the ability to replace video data with textual data, that Kwoh does not disclose or suggest the above-noted features recited in amended claim 1 which indicate that the broadcast wave includes a limit flag

which limits judgment of said judging unit and a release flag which releases the limitation on the judgment, wherein said judging unit is operable to judge, when said receiving unit receives the limit flag while said display unit displays the broadcast contents, that the broadcast contents indicated by the stream information should be continuously displayed after the reception of the limit flag until the release flag is received by said receiving unit, regardless of a user's operation.

With respect to Corvin, Applicants note that this reference discloses a method for forced advertising, in which an advertisement is forcedly presented to a viewer (see Abstract). For example, as explained in Corvin, the playing of a forced advertisement may include preventing the viewer from switching channels, or preventing the user from turning off the user equipment (see paragraph [0024]).

Regarding the above-noted disclosure in Corvin, Applicants note that in the Office Action, the Examiner has taken the position that the “programming tags or data or closed captioning data” which identify the forced advertisements in Corvin correspond to the claimed “limit flag” which limits judgment of said judging unit (see Office Action at pages 2 and 6).

With respect to this position, Applicants respectfully submit that even if the Examiner maintains the position that the data in Corvin which identifies the forced advertisements corresponds to the claimed “limit flag” which limits judgment of said judging unit, that Corvin does not disclose or in any way suggest the use of a “release flag which releases the limitation on the judgment”, as recited in amended claim 1. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Corvin does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted features recited in amended claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Kwoh and Corvin does not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious at least the above-noted combination of features recited in claim 1 which indicate that the broadcast wave includes a limit flag which limits judgment of said judging unit and a release flag which releases the limitation on the judgment, wherein said judging unit is operable to judge, when said receiving unit receives the limit flag while said display unit displays the broadcast contents, that the broadcast contents indicated by the stream information should be continuously displayed after the reception of the limit flag until the release flag is received by said receiving unit, regardless of a user's operation.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

In addition, Applicants note that claim 1 has also been amended so as to recite the features of a function processing unit operable to activate and terminate a predetermined function based on a user's operation, wherein said function processing unit is further operable to cause, when the predetermined function has been activated, said display unit to display a function processing image instead of the broadcast contents while said outline presentation unit presents the outline, the function processing image being generated by the predetermined function and being different from the outline.

Applicants respectfully submit that Kwoh and Corvin do not teach or suggest the above-noted features recited in amended claim 1.

For example, with respect to Kwoh, as described above, this reference discloses a display device having parental control features, in which it is possible to block a video display, and

replace the video display with textual data (see Abstract and col. 16, lines 15-19). In this regard, as explained in Kwoh, an authorized user of the system is able to enable/disable a blocking function which prevents certain broadcast contents from being displayed (see Figs. 8-11 and col. 9, lines 4-8).

Regarding the above-noted disclosure in Kwoh, Applicants note that in the Office Action, the Examiner has taken the position that the ability for a user in Kwoh to enable/disable the blocking function corresponds to the claimed “predetermined function” (see Office Action at page 3). In addition, the Examiner has taken the position that, in Kwoh, the outline (textual data) which is displayed in place of the video display corresponds to the claimed “function processing image” (see page 3 of the Office Action, in which the Examiner has indicated that this “outline is a ‘function processing image’ since it is an image which indicates to the user that the blocking function is processing”).

With respect to the Examiner’s above-noted positions, Applicants note that claim 1 has been amended so as to explicitly indicate that the “function processing image” is “different from the outline”.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that while Kwoh may disclose the ability to display the outline (which the Examiner has indicated corresponds to the “function processing image”) instead of the broadcast contents when the user has enabled the blocking function, that Kwoh clearly does not disclose or suggest the above-noted features recited in amended claim 1 of a function processing unit operable to activate and terminate a predetermined function based on a user’s operation, wherein said function processing unit is further operable to cause, when the

predetermined function has been activated, said display unit to display a function processing image instead of the broadcast contents while said outline presentation unit presents the outline, the function processing image being generated by the predetermined function and being different from the outline.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that Kwoh does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted features recited in amended claim 1. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Corvin does not cure these deficiencies of Kwoh. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claims 3-5 and 9 depend from claim 1 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Regarding claim 12, Applicants note that this claim has been amended so as to recite that the transmission unit is operable to transmit, included in the broadcast wave, a limit flag which imposes a limitation on a display of broadcast contents so that the display of the broadcast contents is forced to continue, and a release flag which releases the limitation imposed by the limit flag.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Kwoh and Corvin does not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted feature recited in amended claim 12. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 12 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Regarding claims 15 and 16, Applicants note that each of these claims has been amended

to recite that the broadcast wave includes a limit flag which limits judgment in said judging step and a release flag which releases the limitation on the judgment, wherein in said judging step, (i) when the limit flag is received in said receiving step while the broadcast contents are displayed in said display control step, it is judged that the broadcast contents indicated by the stream information should be continuously displayed after the reception of the limit flag until the release flag is received in said receiving step, regardless of a user's operation, and when the predetermined function has been activated, the display unit is caused to display a function processing image instead of the broadcast contents while the outline is presented in said outline presentation step, the function processing image being generated by the predetermined function and being different from the outline.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Kwoh and Corvin does not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted features recited in amended claims 15 and 16. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 15 and 16 are patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

B. Claims 6 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwoh et al. (US 6,115,057) and Corvin (US 2001/0054181), and further in view of Tsukagoshi (US 5,684,542).

Claim 6 depends from claim 1, and claim 13 depends from claim 12. Applicants submit that Tsukagoshi fails to cure the deficiencies of Kwoh and Corvin, as discussed above, with

respect to amended claims 1 and 12. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 6 and 12 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

C. Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwoh et al. (US 6,115,057) and Corvin (US 2001/0054181), and further in view of Palmer (US 5,195,135).

Claim 7 depends from claim 1. Applicants submit that Palmer fails to cure the deficiencies of Kwoh and Corvin, as discussed above, with respect to amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 7 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

D. Claims 10 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwoh et al. (US 6,115,057) and Corvin (US 2001/0054181), and further in view of Lee et al. (US 2001/0049296).

Claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 1. Applicants submit that Lee fails to cure the deficiencies of Kwoh and Corvin, as discussed above, with respect to amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 10 and 11 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

## **II. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited.

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may best be resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Kohei YAMAGUCHI et al.

*/Kenneth W. Fields/  
By: 2009.08.05 15:41:05 -04'00'*

Kenneth W. Fields  
Registration No. 52,430  
Attorney for Applicants

KWF/krg  
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
August 5, 2009